

REMARKS

In the final Office Action,¹ the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 4-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0220995 to Hitaka et al. ("*Hitaka*"). By this Amendment, Applicants cancel claims 1 and 4-12, and add new claims 13-30. The rejection of claims 1 and 4-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 1 and 4-12.

Applicants submit that *Hitaka* fails to disclose each and every element of new claims 13-30.

For example, independent claim 16 recites an information processing method comprising, among other things, "detecting a movement of the first cursor [on the first viewing apparatus]; specifying a new thumbnail picture at a new location of the first cursor; transmitting a new thumbnail picture URL associated with the new thumbnail picture from the first viewing apparatus to the second viewing apparatus; receiving, at the second viewing apparatus, the new thumbnail picture URL . . . ; and refreshing the second display unit to display the second cursor at a new location of a new thumbnail picture associated with the new thumbnail picture URL received from the first viewing apparatus."

Consistent with the claimed invention, the above-quoted feature provides, for example, "co-enjoyment" (Applicants' specification, page 3) because "cursors of plural

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

apparatus[es] are located at all times on the same picture" (Applicants' specification, pages 8-9). See Applicants' Figs. 12 and 14.

However, *Hitaka* is silent with respect to detecting a location and movement of a cursor which provides a selection of a picture on an apparatus. *Hitaka* is also silent with respect to transmitting and receiving picture selection information between one apparatus and another apparatus such that the same picture is selected on a plurality of apparatuses. For at least this reason, *Hitaka* fails to disclose the above-quoted feature of claim 16. For at least similar reasons, pending claims 13-30 are allowable over *Hitaka*.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 31, 2007

By: 

Michael R. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,921